





BOSTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12.

TERMS.—\$2.50 per year; \$2 if paid within 3 months.

## THE COMMUNICATION FROM REV. RICHARD FULLER.

We published last week a communication from the Rev. Richard Fuller, of South Carolina, called out by some remarks we had previously made, with reference to a letter from him in the *Christianian*. In our notice of this communication we promised to refer to it again; to review its important points, and, particularly, to consider the question first proposed—Is slavery a moral evil?—Mr. Fuller's intimation in the letter which first appeared in the *Courier*, that the consciences of those who write and preach against slavery are little less than 'bundles of passions tied together,' led us to suggest that the *defenders* of slavery, who had a pecuniary interest in its perpetuity, were quite as likely to have this kind of conscience—to be swayed by passion and self-interest, as the people of the North. Mr. Fuller admits that self-interest influences the judgment, but says it is a mistake that we at the North may not be swayed by prejudices even more strong. He says that other influences, though pecuniary, far more powerful and dangerous, are at this moment disturbing the elements of society. On this point we shall not dispute him. We only maintain, that whatever influences operate at the North to bias men's judgments or pervert their consciences, such as the fanaticism of a wild and heated imagination; spiritual ambition; the lust of popularity; a want of independence in pastors who suffer themselves to be cowed by one or two testy members; the lust of popularity; demagogic propensities and habits; above all, and in multitudes superior to such views, indignation at some real, and more fictitious evils,—we maintain that these and kindred influences are just as liable to operate in the South as in the North. If it requires no little nobleness in a Northern man to view the subject now agitating the country with calmness, it certainly requires as much in a Southern man, who has a natural temperament equally warm, and withal a personal interest, a fraternal sympathy, and what some have termed, 'a birth-place pride,' that combine to influence his decisions and course of action with reference to this great subject. Our Southern brethren, we know very well, have received some erroneous impressions; many of the evils of abolition are 'fictitious'; the pastors are rarely if ever cowed by one or two testy members; the fact more generally is, that the pastors are convinced of the moral evil of slavery, and would like to preach against it; but some are prevented from doing so by the circumstance, that there are in their congregations a few persons who have relatives in the South, or business connections there, which render them exceedingly sensitive to any thing touching the subject. The pastor's dependence, and fear of unhappy excitement, keep him still. This fact is to be regretted, but not to be denied. We believe there would be but one feeling in New England and New York, on the subject of slavery, were it not for the social ties and the business relations, that attach so many of the slaveholding interest in the South. And here ties and relations are so powerful, here is it to be supposed that they do not effect the public sentiment there? He must be a noble soul indeed, and an independent thinker too, who, having been born in South Carolina, and by the ties of consanguinity attached to owners of property in man, and himself an heir to this kind of property,—notwithstanding, yields to a conviction that he ought to give it up—that slavery is a sin. But we are contented to let this point rest. We presume, from the kind manner in which Mr. F. addresses us, that he will never attribute our views to 'a bundle of passions,' instead of a *bona fide* conscience; and we will give him the credit of a sound mind and a sincere desire to know and obey the truth. It is his opinion that 'if cool and candid men from different parts of our country could examine this subject and exchange their views there would not be in our churches that distemper violence which has been displayed on each side; nor indeed that diversity of sentiment which now exists.'—We are gratified with the expression of this sentiment from a Southern man, and are induced by it to hope that our own country will be made the medium of such an exchange of views.

We now pass to a brief notice of Mr. Fuller's strictures on our former article.

1. We did not, in that article, maintain that slavery was, in all points, such an evil as the slave-trade. Still, those very wrongs which render the traffic so odious, give character to the system by which slaves are held after they are made. If it be a dreadful thing to wrench them from their homes and parents in Africa, it is a dreadful thing to separate husbands and wives, parents and children, as they are separated, at all the slave markets in the United States. The domestic affections are stronger here than in heathen Africa, where there is less of mental and moral cultivation, and consequently the pain produced by these forcible separations here is greater. We say, then, that the very reasons why Mr. F. rejoices over the abolition of the slave-trade, should induce him to labor for the abolition of slavery;—not that his labors to make his slaves happy and pious are 'the same as wrenching them from their homes';—those labors are no part of slavery;—but that the simple fact that Mr. F. holds these humane beings as property exposes them, on his decess, or, at any rate, their descendants, to be likewise wrenched from their homes and parents, and doomed to suffer, during their whole lives, what Mr. Fuller terms, 'the abuse of slavery'—what we term, its legitimate results.

2. We said, 'slavery is itself the moral wrong, or its introduction would have been right.' Mr. F. says, 'Let us see. The introduction of what is not a moral wrong is right; therefore the introduction of poverty and disease is right.'—In this logical reply, Mr. F. denies that slavery has any moral character. We were speaking of slavery as a system that is either good or evil;—right or wrong; and in this view, of moral evil. To give perpetuity to this evil, is equally wrong. But again, allowing that the introduction of slavery was only the introduction of physical evil—of calamity—by Mr. F.'s own admission, the calamity still exists. Now to sustain a system that is constantly producing physical evil is morally wrong; therefore slaveholding is morally wrong, call slavery what you will. Whether our logic be true or not, we do not comprehend that which makes the introduction of an evil a

moral wrong, and the perpetuation of it, right. The rum-seller has created the inebriate's burning thirst and inability to take care of himself. He has done a great wrong. Another man has supplied alcoholic drinks to gratify that thirst and continue that inability. But he is doing no wrong. He only lays in the introduction of the evil. Is this good logic?

The last criticism of Mr. F. grows entirely out of his opinion that the abolition of slavery would involve both master and slave in greater calamities than those in which they are now involved. Slavery is so calamitous, but its abolition would bring with it greater calamities. This is a point of no little moment, and the view which Mr. F. takes of it has evidently a predominating influence over him, in his treatment of this whole subject. The question of the moral wrong of slavery he evidently decides on this ground; that both masters and slaves would be injured by the emancipation of the latter. But this is doubtful ground. Mr. F. does not know this. He thinks so, and adds a note from the *Parliamentary Papers* of 1842, which is, that 'in the West Indies the emancipated negroes will not labor for wages, and the British Government is compelled to import Africans, to prevent the utter ruin of the colonies.'—If this be undoubted testimony, it is not all that we have. Mr. Phillippo, a Baptist minister, who has lived on the islands for twenty years, says, in 1843, 'However justly the charge of indolence and improvidence was formerly brought against the peasantry, it is now no longer of general application. The term indolence can only be applied to the black population in the absence of remunerating employment.' We cannot believe that Mr. F. has read the work of Mr. Phillippo. It abounds in testimony of the most satisfactory kind. The editor of the *Jamaica Morning Chronicle*, a high authority so lately as the 17th of February, 1843, says: 'Except as to the want of money-laborers, we have no complaints; and whether regarded socially or politically, the state of Jamaica at present is as favorable as could be desired by the ardent lover of peace and quiet.' The British Secretary for the Colonies made the following report in the House of Commons on the 22d of March, 1844; and his authority is chiefly that of Sir Charles Metcalfe, governor of Jamaica.

'The present condition of the peasantry in Jamaica is very striking. He did not suppose that any peasantry had so many comforts, or so much independence. Their behavior was respectable, and in some respects cheerful. They were found to attend divine service in good clothes, many of them riding on horses. They sent their children to school, and paid for their schooling; and not only attended the churches of their different communities, but subscribed for their respective churches. Their piety was remarkable; and he was happy to add, that in some respects they deserved what they had. They generally well behaved, and free from crime, had much improved in their habits, and were constant in their attendance on divine worship themselves, and in the attendance of their children, and were willing to pay the charges.'

This does not look much like 'moral and physical injury to the emancipated slave,' whatever may have been the state of the colonies. But we have another testimony, fresh and to the point. It is a testimony, too, as a Christian man should admit, reaching as it does, where the Christian looks, beyond mere pecuniary considerations or temporary advantage. It is from the pen of the finest writer and one of the first statesmen of England, and is to be found in the last number of the *Edinburgh Review*, in a masterly article entitled 'The Good Men of Clapham.' Among the characters delineated is that of Zachary Macaulay, a statesman who devoted his best energies to the cause of emancipation. The writer says:

'The author of this portrait enjoyed the happiness denied to the subject of it, not merely of witnessing, but of largely participating in the last great act by which his labors, during so many years, were consummated. With the evil on one side, and with the too glowing anticipations of former times, he has been able to contrast the actual solution of this great practical enigma. He has lived to witness eleven years of unbroken tranquillity throughout the country, where before a single year undisturbed by insurrection was almost unknown. The extinction of feuds apparently irreconcilable—positions full of danger in former years, now converted into bulwarks of our national power—an equal administration of justice in the land; the slave-courts and the court-wire—a loyal and happy peasantry, where the soil was so lately broken by the sullen hands of slaves—penury exchanged for abundance—a population, once cursed by a constant and rapid decay, now progressively increasing—Christian knowledge and Christian worship universally diffused among a people so lately debased by pagan superstition—and the conjugal duties, with all their attendant charities, held in due honor by those to whom laws, written in English language, and sanctioned by the kings of England, had forbidden even the marriage vow. If, with these blessings, have also come the extinction of the cane and the coffee plant, even they who think that to export and to import are the two great ends of the social existence of mankind, have before them a bright and not very distant future.'

We hope Mr. Fuller will think again and much, before he decides fully and forever, that emancipation will bring with it greater evil than now exist. Still, there is a question back on this; Is slavery a moral evil? But our limits will not allow us, in this number of the paper, to continue the discussion farther.

## CUMBERLAND ASSOCIATION, ME.

This religious body held its 33d anniversary the last week in August. The brethren came together, in pretty good numbers, on Tuesday, notwithstanding the unfavorable weather. About the first thing that stirred up a little association feeling was—'father Cass has come.' We had an encouraging representation from our churches, and were favored with the presence of delegates from sister association, and other ministering brethren from abroad. It was evident, that before coming together there was rather a discouraging feeling resting on the minds of many, with respect to the meeting, and a tendency to forebode evil. This, however, was improved for good, as it threw the conscientious more on God in prayer. The Lord be with us! This was the power of the Spirit. This was the great idea of the association, at this sitting.—An unexpected presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all that believed. Be not surprised then that unity and union, dispatch, love, and great spiritual enjoyment and profit characterized all the doings. It really seemed a revival time; and one and another said, my despondency has gone—and I will henceforth gird on my harness afresh.

Bro. A. Wilson presided as moderator. The introductory sermon was preached by Bro. Beecher, from Ezekiel 47: 1-5. 'Subject, "The progress of divine influence." Other discourses were preached on the occasion by brethren Lawton, Ripley, Ricker, Wilson,

and Starr, on Thursday evening. Very efficient and exceedingly interesting prayer-meetings were held both on Wednesday and Thursday mornings. The power of the Spirit was present, greatly to bless. On Wednesday forenoon, after the reading of the letters from the churches, the time—about an hour and a half—was devoted to religious conference and prayer. This season was most precious and joyful. On learning, at this time, of the destitute situation of our good brother Bachelor, missionary to the Arctic, a collection of over \$20 was promptly taken up to aid in furnishing him with a horse. In the evening of this day, was held the anniversary of the Foreign Missionary Society. The drift of the discourse, by Mr. Ricker, was the importance of more efficient and systematic liberality in behalf of the cause, and such active responsibility, on the part of pastors, as to disburse with paid agents. It was agreed to make an effort to raise \$500 for the missionary board this year.

The cause of Sabbath schools excited a good share of interest, and drew forth some very thrilling statements. Our Association Bible Society was organized with a depository. Very good collections were taken up besides the one mentioned above, for the foreign, domestic Missions, and the Bible cause.

In regard to the state of the churches, it appeared that in most of them there was a good degree of harmony of feeling—and in some an increase of the spirit of prayer and liberality. The additions, but not exceeding nine. A resolution expressing our interest for the slave, and our desire and prayer for his speedy emancipation, was introduced with appropriate remarks, and unanimously passed. It was agreed, besides observing the first Monday in the year in special prayer, to set apart the 2d Thursday in Oct. for prayer and fasting. On the whole, the meeting of this body was full of interest and encouragement. May a deeper spirit pervade the sittings of all the several associations, to follow—and, we see the work of the Lord among us, in very deed and truth.

A PASTOR.

## MONTHLY LETTERS ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH.

NUMBER TWO, FOR SEPTEMBER.

I remember when a boy, that I seemed to watch the indications of fair weather, after a long, uncomfortable storm. On the mountains, opposite my birth-place, the clouds and dense masses of fog, which had shut down closely for a considerable time, would begin to roll up the mountain's side, and dividing to the right and left, would let in the glorious sunshine, and then in broader and broader beams, until at length the whole scene became illumined, and the darkness entirely disappeared. So, if I mistake not the signs of the times, there is now indicated over our Southern horizon the incipient manifestation of coming brightness. I have loved to watch the rolling away of some clouds of darkness,—the raying forth of some beams of light. And though we may have to wait still much longer than will be comfortable to our impatient spirits for the unclouded day, still I cannot doubt, that to the eyes of the young, the ardent, and impulsive, as well as to our waning vision, it may be both profitable and welcome to gather up the proofs of this progress, tardy though it may be.

It is generally remarked, that the progress of humanity is manifested by masters in the treatment of their slaves within a few years past, than used to characterize them. Individual cases of this kind have always existed, undoubtedly; but now they are more general and all-pervading. It begins to be a rare spectacle to see the master or mistress neglectful of the personal comfort of the poor dependent creature, which they call their property. British cruelty, except in rare cases of the brutal and passion, is now generally unknown. It is a common remark among slaveholders themselves, that there has been a great melioration of the condition of the blacks within a few years. They repudiate the idea that this has resulted either from regard to their pecuniary interests, or from fear, or from shame; but insist that it has been caused by the progressive increase of the benevolence of Christianity. Has it never occurred to them that this same principle, in its ultimate and perfect triumph, clearly foretells the entire emancipation of the slave? This seems to be a fair deduction from the progress already made; nor are the more intelligent and candid among Southern philanthropists backward to acknowledge the legitimacy and conclusiveness of this argument.

Another little more cheering indication is found in the spirit now at work for the removal of the restrictions of law on intellectual and religious freedom. The laws forbidding to teach colored persons, whether free or slaves, to read, have long been regarded as one of the most painful features of the system of oppression. True, these laws are a mere dead letter in many parts of the South. In the cities and towns you will find a very considerable number who have learned to read, and who assist others who desire this privilege. On the country plantations, too, young master or mistress will frequently teach some favorite house servants the simple elements of language, and they communicate this to a wider circle; though very few of the field hands, so far as my observation extends, can read at all. This violation of the laws has been winked at, tolerated, and even approved, till the conviction is now very common among all classes, that the laws are unnecessary and unwise. I have heard some of the better classes of slaveholders arguing against the continuance of these laws within the last few months, in a way which greatly delighted me. The old stereotype excuse for the existence of such legal restrictions, 'that the abolitionists had caused them, that they had been driven to them in self-defence,' &c. &c. if heard occasionally now, are much less confidently put forth than in former years. If not restrictions are in themselves wrong, no wrong of others can ever make them right; and this seems now to be extensively admitted. Besides, the principle of *self-defence* seems to be better understood than formerly. In every attempt at insurrection, it has been found that ignorance and superstition, not knowledge, have been the great main-springs. Give to the whole slave population of the South full, ample instruction, and they would at once realize that their hope of emancipation must be based on the progress of peaceable principles, and not on violence. This seems to be better understood by the masters than formerly, hence their views and policy in reference to the colored classes begin to change.

I have frequently conferred with the legislators and the administrators of the laws in the Southern States, as well as with professional

men and the common yeomanry; and just in proportion as they have reflected on this subject, have I rejoiced to witness their willingness to admit the needlessness of legal restrictions on teaching their servants to read. Some will argue very shrewdly on the harmlessness or even the benevolence of this legislation,—insisting that oral teaching is just as good for negroes; or that you only make them more miserable, and their bondage more intolerable, by allowing them the ample facilities of intellectual elevation. But Christian men, who see the ultimate bearing and far-reaching influence of such a principle, will scarcely be willing to press it very earnestly. It cuts up by the roots all the apologies for the system of slavery. That cannot be good, and worthy of preservation, which will not bear the light.

There is, too, a shorter and more potent argument in favor of removing these obnoxious laws, which never fails to be conclusive with Christians. The great Legislator of the universe has enacted and published the universal law, 'SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES.' When any of the little puny legislators of earth venture to contravene this, and say to any of the human family, 'You shall not search them'—shall not be taught to perse the inspired and perfect guide for mankind, what is it but rebellion against the divine authority, and treason foul and dark against the most cherished and sacred rights, the most dear and important interests of immortal beings! How soon it may be practicable to reform all this vicious legislation, I will not undertake to predict. If Christians and genuine philanthropists are to form a majority of the voters, I fear, either North or South; and they have long allowed their better aspirations to be repressed by the hopelessness of their success. Some of them, I know, are now determined to put forth an earnest and united endeavor. Let every friend of liberty and religion, of God and man, cheer them on in their efforts. Above all, let us ask them and for ourselves that light, which which cometh from above.

## COMMENCEMENT AT BROWN UNIVERSITY.

The literary exercises connected with the 75th annual Commencement of Brown University were observed in their usual order on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week. They were well attended, and highly satisfactory to visitors and friends. The first exercise was the oration before the Alumni, Tuesday A. M. It was delivered by the Hon. Wm. T. Hunter, a venerable citizen of Providence, and was his first public performance after a long absence from his native State. We did not arrive at Providence in season to hear it, but the papers of that city, we observe, characterize it as 'worthy of a Rhode Island statesman and scholar.' That, of course, is praise enough. His theme was the History of Religious Freedom. If it had only been the *Prospects of Religious Freedom*, we should have known where to apply for an article worthy of that prize, which so few seem to covet. The Providence Journal says:

'He introduced his theme by alluding to the propriety of its discussion upon the soil of a State where religious freedom has been established and maintained in its purity and power, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire, and before the Alumni of a University, none of whose members have ever proved recalcitrant to the great truth. He spoke of the errors yet prevailing upon the subject, and pointed out to the historians the sources of information, from which could be drawn an account of its manifestations in the efforts of the various forces of religion. He refuted the specious but uncanonized statements of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire



the triumph of...

Dr. Charles Van Loon, of New York.

FRAGMENTS; or Remarks on the Nature

re, | Most cordially do we extend the fraternal hand

(in Brooklyn, L. I., and one at Providence, R.

leaped overboard. In less than five minutes

he al circulation, in London, by Americans the

ere. July 18. 4 mi.



